

CLASSIFICATION ~~CONFIDENTIAL~~ **CONFIDENTIAL**

CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY

REPORT

INFORMATION FROM

FOREIGN DOCUMENTS OR RADIO BROADCASTS: CD NO.

50X1-HUM

COUNTRY USSR

SUBJECT Industrial - Machine tools

DATE OF INFORMATION 1949

HOW PUBLISHED Monthly periodical

DATE DIST. *26* Sep 1949

WHERE
PUBLISHED MOSCOW

NO. OF PAGES 3

DATE
PUBLISHED January 1949

SUPPLEMENT TO
REPORT NO.

LANGUAGE Russian

THIS DOCUMENT CONTAINS INFORMATION AFFECTING THE NATIONAL DEFENSE OF THE UNITED STATES WITHIN THE MEANINGS OF ESPIONAGE ACT 50 U. S. C. 31 AND 32, AS AMENDED. ITS TRANSMISSION OR THE REVELATION OF ITS CONTENTS IN ANY MANNER TO AN UNAUTHORIZED PERSON IS PROHIBITED BY LAW. REPRODUCTION OF THIS FORM IS PROHIBITED.

THIS IS UNEVALUATED INFORMATION

SOURCE Stanki : instrument, No 1, 1949.

MACHINE-TOOL PLANT PRODUCTION FOR 1949 SCORED

According to the basic indexes of enterprises of the Ministry of Machine-Tool Building, considerable increase was achieved in 1948 over the actual production in 1947. However, some plants of the press-forging branch of machine building (for example, the Slavygorod Plant, the Plant imeni XVI Congress, and others) did not succeed in fulfilling the yearly plan. Failure to fulfill the plan for such presses as cotton baling presses and special presses was the fault of the Tyazhstankogidropress Plant and Chimkent Plant, respectively. The Main Administration for Forging and Press Machine Building did not come to the assistance of these plants in time to overcome the difficulties encountered in becoming familiar with the design of new machines and assuring the production of these machines.

The 1943 plan, in respect to the output of special and combination machine tools, as well as turret lathes, was not fulfilled because a number of machine-tool-building plants (for example, the Alapayevsk Plant, Stankokonstrutsiya Plant, Plant imeni Sedin, and others) did not master the production of the specified machine tools. One of the reasons for this was poor organization in production planning.

The majority of tool plants worked well. The yearly plan for the production of cutting tools was completed by the 31st anniversary of the October Revolution, and for tool production as a whole by 1 December. However, the Chelyatinsk Tool Plant and the Miass File Plant did not fulfill the plan.

The plan was not satisfactorily fulfilled at all file plants of the Glevinstrument (Main Administration of Cutting Tool Manufacture); in particular, in the production of ordinary hand files. Such a situation existed in part at the Novosibirsk Tool Plant in the production of locksmith and fitting tools.

The output of drills, although fulfilling the yearly plan, did not fully satisfy the consumers' demands for tools of this type. It is intolerable that the output of inch-thread taps is lagging.

- 1 -

CONFIDENTIAL

CLASSIFICATION ~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

[illegible]

CONFIDENTIAL **CONFIDENTIAL**

50X1-HUM

The mining of abrasive materials increased 25.4 percent in comparison with 1947.

The output of cast-iron parts was 22 percent greater in 1948 than in 1947; lathe chucks, 34 percent; magnetic starters (magnitnykh puskateley), 20 percent; electric pumps, 12 percent. According to the Glavstankosmezhprom, gross production was fulfilled 119 percent. Plants for low-voltage apparatus and for machine-tool standards, as well as the Elektrostank Plant, fulfilled the plan 2 months ahead of time.

Some plants of the Ministry, including the tool and abrasive plants, disrupted the lathe-production plan. In many cases this led to a breakdown in the fulfillment of the individual assignments and orders which were extremely necessary for the national economy. This, in turn, led to a surplus of odd parts and finally to a financial crisis in the enterprises concerned. This plan upset occurred at the following plants: the Tyazhstankogidropress Plant, the Plant imeni Lenina, the Komсомоlets Plant, the Leningrad Avtomat Plant and the Sestroretsk Tool Plant.

One of the essential factors in the cost of producing the majority of machine tools, tools and press-forging equipment is the cost of cast materials, the weight of which comprises about 70 percent and more of the weight of machine tools, presses, hammers, and cutters.

As a result of a great deal of work in the mechanization of casting operations carried on in many plants, and due to the well-regulated technology of casting and the introduction of a number of organizational and technical measures, a substantial decrease in the cost of casting was effected.

If the cost for one ton of cast material for machine tools in 1947 is taken to be 100 percent, then the relative cost on one ton of cast material in September 1948 at individual plants is as follows (in percent): Gor'kiy Milling Machine Plant 58, Dmitrov Milling Machine Plant 67.8, Moscow Grinding Machine Plant 69.5, Plant for Manufacture of Small Combination Machine Tools 71, Komсомоlets Plant 73.8, Lenstankolit Plant 74, Srednevolga Plant 79, and Stankolit Plant 83.

For a long time the Gor'kiy Milling Machine Plant (director, Gurikov) lagged behind fulfillment of production programs, planned expenditure of funds for wages, and the level of production cost. Beginning in 1948, the plant started to fulfill and surpass the plan for quantity and quality, and repeatedly took first place in all-Union socialist competition. It pledged 2 million rubles' accumulation above plan in 1948, and is fulfilling this obligation.

In 1948 this plant was assigned the task of reducing the production cost by 24.6 percent. Within only 10 months, a 29-percent decrease was achieved.

Savings in the expenditure of material for machine tools in September 1948 in comparison with 1947 is shown in the following table:

	<u>Decrease in Material Expenditure (in rubles)</u>	<u>Decrease in Consump- tion of Metal (in kg)</u>
6B82G horizontal milling machine	2,877	159
6B12 vertical milling machine	2,826	208
Universal milling machine	3,233	123

Extensive introduction of within-plant cost accounting in all shops of the plant and a method of economizing influenced the level of expenditures in administration. A comparison of the level of expenditures in administration. A comparison of the level of shop and general plant expenditures for unit production in September 1948 in comparison with 1947 is as follows (in percent):

- 2 -

CONFIDENTIAL **CONFIDENTIAL**

CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

50X1-HUM

6B82G horizontal milling machine 41.1, 6B12 vertical milling machine 49.4, and 6B82 universal milling machine 40.7.

However, in organizing the Bolshevik drive for reducing production cost, the plant management did not pay sufficient attention to the problems of reducing loss due to rejects. While losses from rejects were decreased from 4.4 percent (in respect to cost of gross production) in 1947 to 2.8 percent for 9 months in 1948, losses for nonproductive expenses, on the other hand, increased from 1.9 percent in 1947 to 2.3 percent in 9 months of 1948.

Good results were achieved by the Srednevolga Plant (director, Bershadskiy). In the course of 9 months of 1948, the production cost was decreased 17.1 percent instead of the specified 11.1 percent. However, the most noteworthy achievement by this plant is in the output of a most inexpensive lathe having 150 millimeter swing size. The decisive role in this was played by the partial conversion of the plant to conveyor methods of production, as a result of which, in the third quarter of 1948, a decrease of 36.5 percent in comparison with 1947 was effected in the expenditure for wages.

Work is also successfully being carried on in an effort to economize above plan at other machine-tool-building plants; for example, the Plant imeni Molotov, Plant imeni Kirov in Tbilisi, the Turret Lathe and Automatic Machine Plant, Tsentrolit Plant, Krasnyy proletariy Plant, Internal Grinding Machine Plant, Plant imeni Il'ich, the Saratov and Novocherkassk Machine-Tool Plants, Kommunar Plant, and the Plant imeni Kirov in Odessa and others.

It is necessary to note that above-plan saving is connected with over-fulfillment of the production plan. For example, the Voronezh Plant imeni Kalinin (director, Goncharenko) during the first 9 months of 1948 fulfilled the gross-production plan by 114.1 percent and achieved a 50-percent above-plan saving.

Loss from flaws at the Stankolit Plant in the third quarter of 1948 was reduced to 5.5 percent, and for October, to 4.9 percent as opposed to 6.7 percent in 1947.

For saving fuel, the plant has installed on one of its cupola furnaces a device for heating the blast with hot waste gas. This method decreased coke consumption by 25 percent. Such devices will be installed in all of the plant's cupolas.

The development of the stankhanovite technical and economic plan (tekhprom-finplan) at the Kalibr Plant (director, Nesito) is the product of cooperative work between the plant collective and the collective of scientific workers of the Engineering and Economic Institute imeni Ordzhonikidze, under the leadership of Prof E. A. Satel'.

In 10 months of 1948 the production cost at this plant was reduced 17.3 percent as compared with 15.2 percent called for by the yearly plan. The total production cost for 9 months showed an above-plan saving of 1.7 million rubles.

The unit cost of producing basic types of products was also reduced at the plant. For example, the cost of producing a micrometer and a 125-millimeter slide gauge in the third quarter of 1948 was reduced 31 and 28 percent respectively.

- E N D -

- 3 -

CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL